

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 5 (2010) 628–632

Procedia
Social and Behavioral Sciences

WCPCG-2010

An exploratory analysis of the relationship between perfectionism and sociotropy-autonomy

Roja Larijani^a, Mohammad Ali Besharat^b^a*Department of psychology, Tarbiat Moaalem University, Tehran, Iran. (Roja_larijani@yahoo.com)*^b*Department of Psychology, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran*

Received January 14, 2010; revised February 3, 2010; accepted March 12, 2010

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between dimensions of perfectionism and sociotropy-autonomy in a sample of students from the University of Tehran. An exploratory analysis was performed to assess the kind of association exist among three dimensions of perfectionism and two personality constructs, sociotropy and aurnomy. All participants were asked to complete Farsi version of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS) and Sociotropy-Autonomy Scale (SAS). Analysis of the data involved both descriptive and inferential statistics ,The results revealed that all three dimensions of perfectionism were significantly associated with sociotropy and autonomy.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Keywords: Perfectionism, personality, sociotropy, autonomy.

1. Introduction

Investigators view perfectionism as a multidimensional construct and research has determined that different components are related differentially to maladaptive and some adaptive qualities (for reviews see Bieling et al. 2004; Blankstein and Dunkley ,2006; Enns and Cox ,2002; Parker ,2002; Shafran and Mansell, 2001; Stoeber and Otto,2006).Disparate researchers have distinguished the positive and negative aspects of this structure by propounding functional perfectionism as compared with dysfunctional perfectionism, healthy perfectionism as collated with unhealthy perfectionism or normal perfectionism as compared with neurotic perfectionism (Barker, 1997; Terry, Short, Owenz, Oseld and Dewey, 1995; Hamacheck, 1978). When Hamacheck divided perfectionism into normal and neurotic ones, he believed that normal perfectionism enjoys endeavors made to seek superiority. They also regard personal limitations too. Neurotic perfectionism won't be satisfied of its actions due to the unrealistic expectations.Howit and Felt (1991, b) distinguished three dimensions called self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism. Self-oriented perfectionism is discerned tending to formulate unrealistic standards for oneself and accentuation upon defects and failures in implementation of plans together with self-observation, (Hewwit and Fleet, 1991a). This type of perfectionism approximates the structure that which I most often known as perfectionism (Blatt, 1995;Hewitt, mittelstaedt and wollert, 1989), they match indifference, incompatibility, and vulnerability (Kinz and Barker, 1996; Lynd-Stevenson and Hearne, 1999 ;Wyatt and Gilbert, 1998). Other-oriented perfectionism indicates one's penchant to have extreme expectations and critical manners of disparaging others. Socially oriented perfectionism indicates one's feeling to observe the yardsticks and

achievement of prescribed expectations from significant persons to obtain the pertinent confirmation (Howit and Felt, 1991 b).Beck (1983) propounded sociotropy and self-following as two personality-based structures which affect psychological reactions of an individual. Sociotropy or social independence betokens a person's investment in the field of positive interactions with others. This personality-based structure is made up of belief, feedbacks and objectives which propel someone towards others to trust such relationships to attract others' acceptance, sincerity, support and self-regard. Beck (1984; Beck, Epstin, Harrison and Emery, 1983). According to this definition, those who are oversociable have a high esteem of sincere interpersonal relationships. Hence, they believe they ought to be accepted by others, to enjoy their affections. According to the definitions of Clark, Steer, Beck, and Roos (1995) self-following means self-investment to augment and continue an individual's independence, mobility, the freedom to choose and act, achievement of valuable objectives and individual successes, (Beck 1983, Beck and colleagues 1983). Those who are over-followers of themselves believe that they ought to attain high levels of self-management and amazing headways to demonstrate their superiority and independence (Clark and colleagues, 1995).according to the extant findings no researches on the relationships between such variables and personal structures of sociotropy and self-following has been effectuated apart from the pre-stated analyses on the relationship between diverse dimensions of perfectionism and personality disorders, so that precise postulations can be compiled on the tripartite dimensions of perfectionism and personality structures. The chief goal of the extant research waist is to explore the relationship between the dimensions of perfectionism and the personality-based structures of sociotropy and self-following. This type of exploratory research is among the correlational research samples which are used to examine samples of correlational researches between perfectionism dimensions and personality structures.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

The statistical community of this research comprise the expert students of the bachelor degree of Tehran University which were studying in the educational year 1382-83. The final sample of the research comprised 520 undergraduates (260 girls and 260 boys)(table 1)

2.2 Instruments

Multidimensional perfectionism scale, the dimensions of the perfectionism of the tested ones was determined in this research by means of the Iranian version of perfectionism scale, (Frost,Marten, Lhart, Rozenblatee 1990; Frost, Heimberg, Holt, Matiya and Newberer, 1993, Hewwit and Fleet, 1991a). This scale is a 30-question test which gauges three dimensions named self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism and society-oriented perfectionism.Sociotropy scale, self-following, sociotropy characteristics and self-following features of the testable ones were quantified by means of self-following sociotropy, self-following, (SAS, Beck and colleagues, 1983), this scale is a 60-question test which measures two personality structures called self-following and sociotropy.

3. Results

Table 1 limns the statistical features based upon the perfectionism dimensions and personality structures of the sociotropy and self-following a segregated based upon the sexuality of the students.

Table1.Means and standard deviations of perfectionism and sociotropy-autonomy

	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
age	21/15	2/24	22/35	2/82
Self-oriented perfectionism	33/55	5/26	34/30	5/14
Other-oriented perfectionism	27/90	5/43	28/70	5/73
Socially prescribed perfectionism	28/45	6/35	25/95	5/21
Sociotropy	16/35	69/51	67/95	16/27
autonomy	69/37	14/68	71/10	14/69

The summarized upshots of T Test indicates that the difference in mean grade of female and male undergraduates was significant within the perfectionism dimension of the society ($p < 0.001$, $t_{4.90} = 518$). The upshots of Pearson

correlation experiment indicated that there is a significant correlation between self-oriented perfectionism grade and sociotropy ($r=-0.11$) and self-following ($r=0.28$) between other-oriented perfectionism and sociotropy ($r=0.33$) And between sociotropic perfectionism and sociotropy ($r=0.44$) and self-following ($r=0.19$). The upshots of variance analysis and regression statistical features has been propounded between sociotropy and perfectionism dimensions in table 2.

Table2.Results From Linear Multiple Regression, Analysis of sociotropy variance With a Control for the Effects of perfectionism

	SS	df	Ms	F	P	R	R ²	SE
Regression	57604/10	3	19201/368	122/856	0/00	0/645	0/417	12/501
Residual	80646/20	516	156/291					

VARIABLE	INDEX				
	B	SEB	Beta	T	P
Self-oriented perfectionism	-1/656	0/126	0/529	-13/191	0/000
Other-oriented perfectionism	0/809	0/116	0/277	6/982	0/000
Socially prescribed perfectionism	-1/599	0/115	-0/582	-13/941	0/000

according to such results, the quantity of F under observation is pivotal ($p<0.001$), (and 41% variance of the sociotropy is expressed by means of the tripartite dimensions of perfectionism ($R=0.41$)). the regression coefficient of the predicted variables indicates that the tripartite dimensions of perfectionism can be used to express the variable variance of the sociotropy of undergraduates in a meaningful manner. The effective coefficients of the self-oriented perfectionism ($B=-1.65$), other-oriented perfectionism ($B=0.80$) and society-oriented perfectionism ($B=-1.59$) regarded together with t statistical units indicate that these three variables can be used to predict the variables pertinent to the sociotropy variable, that is to say, any increase in self-oriented and sociotropic perfectionism can bring about the curtailment of sociotropy and any increase of perfectionism of the other circuit can increase sociotropy. The upshots of the variance analysis and the statistical characteristics of the regression pertinent to the link between the self-following and the perfectionism dimensions in table 3.

Table3.Results From Linear Multiple Regression, Analysis of autonomy variance With a Control for the Effects of perfectionism

	SS	df	Ms	F	P	R	R ²	SE
Regression	26630/31	3	8876/77	53/564	/000	0/487	0/237	12/873
Residual	85512/11	516	165/721					

VARIABLE	INDEX				
	B	SEB	Beta	T	P
Self-oriented perfectionism	1/44	0/129	0/513	11/172	0/000
Other-oriented perfectionism	5/757	0/119	0/022	0/483	0/630
Socially prescribed perfectionism	1/155	0/118	0/467	9/780	0/00

according to these upshots the amount of the F under observation is significant ($p<0.001$) and 23% of the variance pertains to self-following is expressed by the tripartite dimensions of perfectionism ($R^2=0.23$), the regression coefficients of the predicted variables indicates that only two dimensions of the tripartite dimensions of perfectionism that is to say, the self-oriented perfectionism and the sociotropic perfectionism can be used to express the variable variance of the self-following features of undergraduates in a significant manner. The coefficients of the effect of self-oriented perfectionism ($B=1.44$) and sociotropic perfectionism ($B=1.15$) regarding t statistical units indicate that these two variables can be used to predict the alterations pertinent to the self-following variable, that is to say, any augmentation in self-oriented perfectionism and sociotropic perfectionism can increase self-following features. Similar analyses have been made to check the relationship between the sociotropic perfectionism with personality structures of sociotropy and self-following as segregated by the sexes of the undergraduates. The F under observation for male undergraduates was pivotal in both structures ($p<0.001$). The determination coefficients were reckoned as follows: sociotropy ($R^2=.25$), self-following ($R^2=0.15$). Calculation of the regression coefficients

of the prediction variable as compared with standard-based variables indicated that sociotropic perfectionism can be used to predict the alterations pertinent to the variance of the sociotropic variables and self-following on a 99% assurance level. According to these findings, any augmentation in sociotropic perfectionism in male undergraduates can reduce the sociotropic level ($B=-1.58$) and increase of self-following ($B=1.10$). The f under observation in female students was only pivotal in the personality structure of the sociotropy ($p<0.001$), hence, the determination coefficient was reckoned as expressed above, ($R=0.16$). The calculation of the regression coefficient of the prediction variable as pertinent to the standard variable indicated that sociotropic perfectionism can be used to predict the alterations of the variance of the sociotropy variable. According to such findings, any augmentation of sociotropic perfectionism in female undergraduates can reduce sociotropy ($B=-1.04$).

4. Discussion

The research upshots indicated that any increase in self-oriented perfectionism can cause curtailment of sociotropy and escalation of self-following in both sexes. Any increase in other-oriented perfectionism can cause the escalation of sociotropy in both sexes. Nevertheless it is not related to the self-following structure. Any augmentation of sociotropic perfectionism in male students accompanies reduction of sociotropy and increase of self-following features. Such a feature can only reduce the sociotropy of girls. These findings which are exploratory are expressed based upon several possibilities. 1. Self-concentration as the common feature of the sociotropic perfectionism and self-following can be used to justify the positive correlation of these two variables. Self-oriented perfectionism paves the way for the success of people in personal investments, achieving high levels of self-management and obtaining excellent personal achievements (Beck, 1983; Beck and colleagues, 1983; Clark, Steve, Beck, and Roos, 1995). 2. The self-concentration mechanism deters people to make any investments to make interactions with others which are the chief feature of sociotropy. Negative correlation between self-oriented perfectionism and sociotropy is justified on this basis. 3. The importance of interpersonal relationships can be regarded as the chief mechanism to express the positive correlation between the other-oriented perfectionism and sociotropy. Other-oriented perfectionism relates people to each other through effectuation of extreme expectations to achieve excellent standards to realize excellent criteria to make a relationship between the person in question and others and sociotropy through over-evaluation of interpersonal relationships and expectation to be accepted by others to be loved. 4. The chief feature of sociotropic perfectionism for someone is to feel necessary and to observe criteria to fulfill expectations prescribed by others by the person in question (Howit and felt, 1991,b). Sociotropy means someone's tendency to make investments in positive interactions with others (Beck, 1984; Beck and colleagues 1983; Clark and colleagues, 1995). Hence, the feelings related to imposition of others' feelings makes someone related to others. It conflicts with expectations of a sociotropic person to establish interpersonal positive and sincere relationships and their expectations from others to be accepted by them.

References

- Adkins, K. K., & Parker, W. D. (1996). Perfectionism and suicidal preoccupation. *Journal of Personality*, 64, 529-543.
- Alden, L. E., Bieling, P. J., Wallace, S. T. (1994). Perfectionism in an interpersonal context: A self-regulation analysis of dysphoria and social anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 18, 297-311.
- Beck, A. T. (1983). *Cognitive therapy of depression: new perspectives*. In Clayton, P. J. & Barrett, J. E. (Eds.), *treatment of depression: old controversies and new approaches*. Raven Press: New York.
- Beck, A. T., Epstein, N., Harrison, R. P., & Emery, G. (1983). *Development of the sociotropy-autonomy scale: A measure of personality factors in psychopathology*. Unpublished manuscript, Philadelphia: Center for Cognitive Therapy, University of Pennsylvania Medical School.
- Bieling, P. J., Israeli, A., & Antony, M. M. (2004). Is perfectionism good, bad, or both? Examining modelsof the perfectionism construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 1373–1385.
- Blatt, S. J. (1995). The destructiveness of perfectionism: implications for the treatment of depression. *American Psychologist*, 50, 1003-1020.
- Burns, D. D. (1980). The perfectionist's script for self-defeat. *Psychology Today*, 14, 34-52.
- Blankstein, K. R., & Dunkley, D. M. (2002). Evaluative concerns, self-critical, and personal standards perfectionism: A structural equation modeling strategy. In G. L. Flett, & P. L. Hewitt (Eds.) *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 285–315). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Clark, D. A., Beck, A. T., & Stewart, B. (1989). *Sociotropy and autonomy: cognitive vulnerability markers or symptom variable?* Paper presented at the World Congress of Cognitive Therapy, June 28-July 2, Oxford, England.
- Clark, D. A., Steer, R. A., Beck, A. T., & Ross, L. (1995). Psychometric characteristics of revised Sociotropy and Autonomy Scale in college students. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 33, 325-334.
- Dunkley, D. M., Zuroff, D. C., & Blankstein, K. R. (2006). Specific perfectionism components versus self-criticism in predicting maladjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 665–676.

- Enns, M. W., & Cox, B. J. (2002). The nature and assessment of perfectionism: A critical analysis. In G.L. Flett, & P. L. Hewitt (Eds.) *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 33–62). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Blankstein, K. R., & O'Brien, S. (1991). Perfectionism and learned resourcefulness in depression and self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 61-68.
- Freud, S. (1959). *Inhibition, symptoms and anxiety*. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 20, 77-175), London: Hogart. (original work published 1926).
- Frost, R. O., Heimberg, R. G., Holt, C. S., Mattia, J. I., & Neubauer, A. L. (1993). A comparison of two measures of perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 14, 119-126.
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14, 449-468.
- Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology*, 15, 27-33.
- Frost, R. O., & Steketee, G. (1997). Perfectionism in obsessive-compulsive disorder patients. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 35, 291-296.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991a). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: conceptualization, assessment and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 456-470.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991b). Dimensions of perfectionism in unipolar depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100, 98-101.
- Hewitt, P.L., Mittelstaedt, W., & Wollert, R. (1989). Validation of a measure of perfectionism. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53, 133-144.
- Hill, R. W., Zrull, M. C., & Turlington, S. (1997). Perfectionism and interpersonal problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 69, 81-103.
- Lynd-Stevenson, R. M., & Hearne, C. M. (1999). Perfectionism and depressive affect: the pros and cons of being a perfectionist. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 549-562.
- Parker, W. D. (1997). An empirical typology of perfectionism in academically talented children. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34, 545-562.
- Robins, C. J., & Block, P. (1988). Personal vulnerability, life events, and depressive symptoms: a test of a specific interaction model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 847-852.
- Shafran, R., Cooper, Z., & Fairburn, C. G. (2002). Clinical perfectionism: A cognitive-behavioural analysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 40, 773–791.
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 295–319.
- Terry-short, L. A., Owens, R. G., Slade, P. D., & Dewey, M. E. (1995). Positive and negative perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 18, 663-668.
- Wyatt, R., & Gilbert, P. (1998). Dimensions of perfectionism: a study explore their relationship with perceived social rank and status. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24, 71-79.